Appalachian State University
Faculty Senate Agenda
March 20, 2017
AGENDA SUMMARY:
(Full Agenda follows on next page)

(3:15 pm)  I.  Announcements
            INFORMATION

(3:20 pm)  II. Approval of the Faculty Senate Minutes
            ACTION

(3:25 pm)  III. Visitors’ Reports
            INFORMATION

(3:30 pm)  IV. Provost’s Report
            INFORMATION

(3:45 pm)  V. Chair’s Report
            INFORMATION

(4:00 pm)  VI. Committee Reports
            A. Academic Policy Committee
            INFORMATION
            B. Agenda Committee
            INFORMATION
            C. Budget Committee
            INFORMATION
            D. Campus Planning Committee
            INFORMATION
            E. Campus Technology Committee
            INFORMATION
            F. Committee on Committees
            INFORMATION
            G. Faculty Governance Committee
            INFORMATION
            H. Faculty Welfare and Morale Committee
            ACTION
            I. Welfare of Students Committee
            INFORMATION

(4:45 pm)  VII. Unfinished Business

(5:10 pm)  VIII. New Business
            ACTION

(5:30 pm)  IX. Adjourn (time approximated)
I. **Announcements**

A. Welcome and Introduction of Visitors.

II. **Minutes**

A. Approval of February 13, 2017 Faculty Senate minutes. Available online at:
   https://facsen.appstate.edu/sites/facsen.appstate.edu/files/Faculty%20Senate%20Minutes%20draft%20February%202017.pdf

III. **Visitors’ Reports**

IV. **Provost’s Report**

V. **Chair’s Report**

VI. **Committee Reports** (Committee Chair’s name is in bold.)

A. Academic Policy Committee (Crepeau, Fiske, Osinsky, Pitofsky, Wheeler, Stephenson/Waldroup)
   No report.

B. Agenda Committee (Frye, Gates, Reed, Spaulding, Provost Kruger)
   No report.

C. Budget Committee (Mohr, Dunston, Kelley, Szeto, Wright)
   No report.

D. Campus Planning Committee (Doll, Ignatov, Marshall, Madritch, Salinas)
   1. Update on Howard Street Hall Furnishings

E. Campus Technology Committee (Spiceland, Spaulding, Rice, Hartley, Cook, Fenwick, Reed)
   1. Report

F. Committee on Committees (Frye, Sibley/Weedell, Gambrel, Cockerill/Dubino, McGaha)
   No Report.

G. Faculty Governance Committee (Frye, Gates, Collier, Dalton, Rardin)
   1. Report – Appendix A

H. Faculty Welfare and Morale Committee (Albinsson, Campbell, Hageman, Hester, Howard, Newmark/Sparks, Phillips, Thaxton, Villanova)
   1. Resolution: Peer Observation of Teaching Policy- Appendix B
I. Welfare of Students Committee (Zrull, West, Shulstad, Hamilton, Fitts/Goodson-Espy, Ortiz)
   1. Report on Faculty Student Listening Sessions.

(4:45 pm) VII. Unfinished Business

(5:10 pm) VIII. New Business

A. Science for Sustainability Resolution Introduced by the Sustainable Development Department – Appendix C

(5:30 pm) IX. Adjournment
Appendix A- Faculty Senate Meeting - March 20, 2017

Paul,

Below are the questions used in the online course evaluation pilot. We will need a senate committee to review these and recommend university level questions.

Thanks,

Jim

James C. Denniston, Ph.D.
Professor and Chair
Department of Psychology
Appalachian State University
(828) 262-2272 x402

Likert-Scale Questions

1. Overall, I consider this individual to be an effective instructor
2. Overall, this course was a valuable learning experience for me.
3. The instructor provided timely evaluation of student work.
4. The instructor was available to students for help and support.
5. The course contributed to my knowledge of the subject matter.

Open-Ended Questions:

1. What were your instructor’s strengths?
2. How could your instructor improve his/her teaching?
Appendix B - Faculty Senate Meeting - March 20, 2017

Faculty Senate Resolution: Peer Observation of Teaching Policy

Whereas the matter of instructional quality is central to the mission of Appalachian State University (ASU);

Whereas the manner of assuring instructional quality is of material and central importance to the purpose of faculty governance;

Whereas peer observation of teaching is currently required of all University of North Carolina (UNC) campuses as mandated by Administrative Memorandum #338 issued by UNC System President Spangler in 1993 (see Attachment 1);

Whereas in 1994 the Guidelines for Peer Classroom Observations (hereafter, the Guidelines) were adopted by an ad hoc committee comprised of ASU Faculty Senate and the ASU Office of Academic Affairs established mandated that academic departments develop procedures in consonance with the Guidelines (see Attachment 2);

Whereas the ASU Faculty Handbook (revised August 3, 2015, section 4.3.1) acknowledges that peer observation of faculty includes direct observation of classroom teaching and is a necessary component of faculty evaluation;

Whereas the Guidelines as currently constituted are often inexplicit, indefinite, and prone to various interpretations;

Whereas, based on the recent solicitation of departmental responses by the faculty welfare and morale committee, it is apparent that the implementation of the Guidelines are not consistently applied across academic departments so that departments are at great variance in their peer observation practices;

Whereas also based on the recent solicitation of departmental responses by the faculty welfare and morale committee, it is commonly reported that various departments across campus have found the process of abiding by the current ASU guidelines to be burdensome;

Whereas it is desirable that peer observation practices maintain some common features across departments so as to provide greater assurance of proper, comparable, and fair implementation of this requisite process in faculty evaluation and;

Whereas, a more universal practice should not unreasonably encumber departments from adopting peer observation practices best suited to meeting the mission of instructional quality;

Therefore, be it RESOLVED that a peer observation committee composed of an equal number of administrative and faculty senate representatives be convened by the Provost to amend the current ASU guidelines so that they are more consistent with the following features.
1. Each academic department must provide for direct classroom observation by peer(s) in at least one course prior to any promotion or post-tenure review for all tenured faculty.
2. Probationary, non-tenure track faculty, and teaching assistants are subject to peer observation in at least one class on an annual basis and prior to any personnel decision involving a probationary faculty member.
3. Peer(s) is to be defined by each individual department.
4. Peer observations require direct classroom observation using an instrument designated for that purpose by the department.
5. Peer observations require a written narrative of their observation, assessment, and recommendations.
6. Written narratives and the instrument used by the department as a formal record of peer observation must be conveyed to the observed faculty member in a timely manner.
7. A copy of the written narrative and instrument prepared by the peer observer(s) must be presented to the department chair of the faculty member being observed.
8. Observed faculty members may exercise the option of electing a second peer observer at their discretion.
9. Departments may adopt recourse to appeals procedures as they deem appropriate.
Resolution Introduced by the Faculty of the Department of Sustainable Development

Appalachian State University is committed to advancing knowledge, providing high-quality education, and contributing to a just, healthy, and sustainable future. For centuries, advances in the natural and social sciences have helped us understand and steward our world in the face of increasing human impact on the environment. However, scientific inquiry, open and transparent discourse about science, and evidence-based policy-making seem to be threatened by proposed actions by the United States government. In order to uphold our mission as a public-serving institution of higher education, we therefore commit to protecting evidence-based inquiry and its ethical application.

While politics can play an important role in ensuring the thoughtful and ethical application of evidence, recent events have created unprecedented attacks on science and evidence-based inquiry and its application to environmental policy and management. These attacks have included the attempted political control of research, censoring of data and results on critical issues, veiled and open threats against academic and agency scientists involved in key environmental research, and undermining the use of scientific evidence in environmental decision-making. Most notably, it has included threats to eliminate the Environmental Protection Agency, and to eliminate funding for climate change research and communication. Collectively, these actions would limit scientific progress, significantly constrain healthy scientific debate, and weaken policy-making at local, state, and national scales.

This concerted effort to undermine research and its responsible application to social and ecological problems also constitutes a direct threat to ASU. Among other points, it undermines our mission to prepare students “to lead purposeful lives as engaged global citizens who understand their responsibilities in creating a sustainable future for all.” This mission requires the critical and ethical application of evidence and reason to address problems, as well as a commitment to engagement, action, and service.

As a faculty we reaffirm this commitment. It is our responsibility to ensure that scholars are not silenced just because their research questions powerful interests, that research on critical issues related to society and the environment are not undermined through withdrawal of funding, and that environmental and other policies must be based on the ethical application of available evidence.

In short, we affirm our commitment to Appalachian as a protector of science and its responsible application in order to create a just, healthy, and sustainable future. This includes taking concrete actions such providing an open forum for researchers who are targeted, presenting on behalf of scientists who are silenced, and supporting research in areas that are politically targeted with defunding.